



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

fearful fighters all of them. But no; not quite all, either. On a sandy stretch of seashore, half hidden by the unwieldy empires around it, we see a timid, peaceful little people called the Hebrews; but they alone, from all that mighty company, have stood the "wreckful siege" of thirty centuries. Watch its sinister movement down the ages, and you will see the war cloud hover over Greece, and her republics melt to nothing in disunion and decay. It hovers over the Huns, and they suddenly sink from sight; over Islam, and its civilization crumbles faster than it grew; over Spain, and all the New World treasures cannot save her from decay. Finally, like the cloud no bigger than a hand, it rises from the island of Corsica and moves toward central Europe. All too well does Europe know its meaning. From north and south, from east and west, she pours into the field the finest armies that the Old World ever saw. Then she pauses. Europe grows tense with a nameless dread. The storm cloud blackens, hovers lower, then bursts with all its fury through the continent. For ten long years, at the command of an imperial butcher, the soil is drenched with blood; the sky grows lurid from burning Paris to burning Moscow; three million homes are draped in black. Grand, indeed, and glorious! But Europe lost more than her gorgeous standards, more than her ruined cities; she left her manhood on those fields.

We might extend the awful picture, but the story is the same dread tale of death for nations as for men. Is not this enough? Is it not clear that this traitor to labor, this despoiler of ideals, this foe to morality is not the benefactor, but the destroyer of nations? And shall we not "here highly resolve" no longer to walk in this "valley of the shadow of death," but to hasten toward the dawning of a brighter, purer day? For in spite of pessimism, in spite of scholarship, in spite of history, the day is

"Coming yet for a' that,  
That man to man, the world o'er,  
Shall brothers be, for a' that."

### National Honor and Vital Interests.\*

By C. Russell Weisman, of Western Reserve University.

The day for deprecating in general terms the evils of war and of extolling the glories of peace is past. Such argument is little needed. International trade requires peace. International finance dictates peace. Even armies and navies are now justified primarily as agents of peace. Yet so wantonly are these agents looting the world's treasures that they are themselves forcing their own displacement by courts of arbitration. The 250 disputes successfully arbitrated in the past century challenge with trumpet-tongued eloquence the support of all men for reason's peaceful rule. Today no discussion is needed to show that if war is to be abolished, if navies are to dwindle and armies diminish, if there is to be a federation of the world, it must come through treaties of arbitration. In this way alone lies peace; yet in this way lies the present great barrier to further progress—the conception which many nations, especially the United States, hold of "national honor and vital inter-

ests." The reservation from arbitration of so-called matters of national honor and vital interests constitutes the weak link in every existing arbitration treaty between the great powers of the world. This reservation furnishes the big-navy men all the argument they need. It destroys the binding power of the treaties by allowing either party to any dispute to refuse arbitration. It was by this reservation that the United States Senate so lately killed the British and the French treaties. And I contend here tonight that the one subject which imperatively demands discussion is national honor and vital interests; that the next important step must be the exposure of the reactionary influence of the United States in excepting these matters from arbitration.

Only fifteen months ago President Taft made his memorable declaration that this barrier ought to be removed from the pathway of peace. He proposed that the United States negotiate new treaties to abide by the adjudication of courts in every international issue which could not be settled by negotiation, whether involving honor, or territory, or money. The next morning the proposal was heralded by the press throughout the world. A few days later the halls of Parliament resounded with applause when Great Britain's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs announced that his government would welcome such a treaty with the United States. France soon followed. Then, to the surprise of all, hesitating Germany and cautious Japan showed a like willingness to enter into such agreements. Universal peace seemed all but realized.

The cause was at once borne up on a mighty wave of public opinion. The peace societies were in a frenzy of activity. Mass meetings of endorsement were held in England and America. Editorials of approval appeared in all parts of the world. The movement was now irresistible. Within eight months the British and French treaties were drafted. Three of the greatest nations of the world were at last to commit themselves unreservedly to the cause of international peace. Even disputes involving national honor should not halt the beneficent work of high courts of law and of reason. The day when the treaties were signed, August 3, 1911, was hailed as a red-letter day in the annals of the civilized world. It was proclaimed the dawn of a new and auspicious era in the affairs of men and of nations.

During all the months preceding the action of the Senate on these treaties the only statesman of any prominence to raise his voice in opposition was ex-President Theodore Roosevelt. The gist of his successive and violent attacks on the treaties is contained in this utterance, which I quote: "It would be not merely foolish, but wicked, for us as a nation to agree to arbitrate any dispute that affects our vital interests or our independence or our honor." In this spirit, to the surprise and disappointment of the whole nation, the Senate amended the treaties out of their original intent, and placed upon them limitations that defeated their purpose. By the Senate's action the United States is still committed to the pretense that there may be occasion for a just and solemn war, that vital interests and national honor may force us to fight.

What, then, are the vital interests that can be conserved only by saber and bullet? Nothing more, nothing less, according to various acknowledged authorities, than a State's independence and its territorial integrity. Did the keen mind of our former President really fore-

(\*This oration won second prize in the National Intercollegiate Peace Prize Contest held at Mohonk Lake, during the Arbitration Conference, on May 16, 1912.—Ed.)

see the seizure of some of our territory by England or France? Yet he protests that it would be "not merely foolish, but wicked, for us as a nation to agree to arbitrate any dispute that affects our vital interests." Did Senator Lodge and his threescore colleagues who amended the treaties actually fear an attempt to overthrow our form of government, to destroy our political institutions, or to take away those individual rights and sacred privileges upon which our Government was founded? Yet to save us from such fate they refused unlimited arbitration.

For the United States to except from arbitration her vital interests is obvious pretense. To add thereto her national honor is extreme hypocrisy. What is national honor? No man knows. It is one thing today, another tomorrow. It may involve an indemnity claim, a boundary line, a fisheries dispute. In fact, any controversy may be declared by either party at will to be a question of national honor. Thus in the hands of an unskilled or malicious diplomacy any question which was originally a judicial one may become a question of national honor. What, then, will we arbitrate? Every case in which a favorable award is assured us. If we want Texas, we send an army after it. Every case that does not rouse our anger. Let the "Maine" blow up, and we fight. A treaty with an elastic exception like this is a farcical sham and a delusion.

It is high time the true and humiliating significance of these fearsome phrases should be as familiar to every taxpayer as is the burden of bristling camps and restless navies. Read the record of Great Britain's first offer of unlimited arbitration, in the Olney-Paunceforte treaty of 1897. There, too, you will find national honor and vital interests clogging the machinery of universal peace. By these same exceptions the Senate emasculated that treaty and defeated the spirit of the agreement. Is it conceivable that the Senate actually feared that our interests would be imperiled by that treaty? Did it delve out some hidden dangers which escaped the careful scrutiny of both the English and American embassies, some peril unforeseen by the keen judicial mind of President Cleveland, who characterized the defeat of the treaty as "the greatest grief" of his administration.

But this is not all. The American representatives at both Hague conferences were the first to place these same limitations on all arbitration proposals.

Look at it from what point of view you will, our Government's conduct must appear humiliating. Considering the fact that universal arbitration treaties have proved practical, it is well nigh incredible. Behold our bellicose sister American republics. Argentina and Chile, Brazil and Argentina, Bolivia and Peru, all have agreements for the arbitration of all questions whatsoever. All the Central American republics are bound by treaty to decide every difference of whatever nature in the Central American court of justice. Denmark's three treaties with Italy, Portugal, and the Netherlands withhold no cause, however vital, from reason's peaceful sway. Norway and Sweden likewise have an agreement to abide by the decision of the Hague Court in whatever disputes may occur. The very existence of all these treaties is significant, yet even more significant is the fact that they have been triumphantly tested. Norway and Sweden at one extremity of the globe and Argentina and Chile at the

other have thus quietly settled disputes in which their honor and interests were seriously involved.

Do you ask further evidence of the hypocrisy with which our Senate parades our national honor and our vital interests to the undoing of a grand work? Search our history, and you will find it in abundance. In the great case of the Alabama claims, Charles Francis Adams pronounced the construction of Confederate ships in English ports to be a violation of the international law of neutrality. This certainly was a question of national honor and vital interests, yet he pleaded for arbitration. In reply Lord John Russell said: "That is a question of honor which we will never arbitrate, for England's honor cannot be made the subject of arbitration." The case was debated for six years. Then came England's "Grand Old Man," the mighty Gladstone, with a different view. "It is to the interest," he said, "not only of England and the United States, but of the world, to peaceably settle those claims." He submitted them to a joint high commission. England lost and paid. Thus the honor of both nations was successfully arbitrated. Likewise the Newfoundland fisheries case had been a bone of contention between Great Britain and America from the day our independence was recognized. As late as 1887 it threatened to become the cause of war. No question ever arose which more vitally affected the interests of America, yet the Senate recently accepted a settlement by arbitration. Similarly the Alaska fur-seal dispute, the Alaskan and the Venezuelan boundary disputes, and the Northeast boundary controversy all involved both the vital interests and the national honor of England and America, yet all were satisfactorily and permanently arbitrated. So excited were we over our Northwest boundary that the principal issue of a political campaign was "All Oregon or None; 54-40 or Fight." Yet we peaceably acquiesced in a treaty that gave us neither.

Yes, our honor may be arbitrated. If we are ill prepared for war, we arbitrate. If we are sure of a favorable award, we arbitrate. But we must have a loophole, an ever-ready escape from obligation. Posing as the most enlightened nation on the face of the globe, we refuse entirely to displace those mediæval notions according to which personal honor found its best protection in the duelling pistol, and national honor its only vindication in slaughter and devastation. To unlimited arbitration we refuse to submit.

Fifteen years ago England, the mighty England, gave us her pledge that no cause should ever justify war. This pledge our Senate in the name of honor refused. Unlimited arbitration agreements were promulgated at both Hague conferences. Americans promptly placed restrictions upon them in the name of honor. Again has England with enthusiasm just offered us unrestricted arbitration. Again she is repulsed by our Senate in the name of honor. France, too, bears to our doors an unqualified pledge of arbitration. France, too, is repulsed by our Senate in the name of honor. Germany and Japan express a desire to settle every question at the bar of justice. Impelled by honor, we pass their desire unheeded. Our Cleverlands, our Olneys, our Edward Everett Hales, our Carl Schurz, our John Hays, have all urged unlimited arbitration. Our Davises and Clarks and Platts and Quays in Senate seats have undone their work in the name of honor. Our Charles Eliots and Nicholas Butlers, our Albert

Shaws and Hamilton Holts now plead for universal peace through unlimited arbitration. Senators Bacon and Lodge and Heyburn and Hitchcock, apparently impelled by constitutional prerogative, party prejudice, or personal animosity, now cast the votes for limitations in the name of honor. From the platform of peace conferences, from the halls of colleges, from the pulpit and the bench, from the offices of bankers and merchants and manufacturers, from the press with scarcely a column's exception, there arises a swelling plea for treaties of arbitration that know no exceptions. In the name of honor that plea is defied.

Honor? No; an ocean of exception large enough to float any number of battleships for which pride and ambition may be willing to pay! Honor? No; a finical and foolish reservation that at any moment may become a maelstrom of suspicion and rage and hatred and destruction and death! Honor? No; a mountainous barrier to peace that must be leveled before there can be progress! Honor? No; the incarnation of selfishness, the cloak of shrewd politics, the mask of false patriotism! National honor? No; national dishonor!

Before the nations of the world the United States stands today in an unenviable light. It is a false light. Since the days of William Penn and Benjamin Franklin our people have led in much of the march upward from the slough of weltering strife. Many a stumbling-block to progress we have removed from the rugged pathway; but for fifteen years our Government has refused to touch the barrier of national honor and vital interests. England and France have now laid this duty squarely at our door. "It is a social obligation as imperative as the law of Moses, as full of hope as the Great Physician's healing touch." Let us here highly resolve that there shall be uttered a new official interpretation of national honor and vital interests, an interpretation synonymous with dignity and fidelity, sincerity and integrity, and confidence in the vows both of men and of nations. "If we have 'faith in the right as God gives us to see the right,' we shall catch a vision of opportunity that shall fire the soul with a spirit of service which the darkness of night shall not arrest, which the course of the day shall not weary."

### President Taft's Arbitration Policy.

**Address of Hon. Richard Bartholdt on the Naval Appropriation Bill in the House of Representatives,  
May 23, 1912.**

MR. BARTHOLDT: Mr. Chairman, this year the battleship question finds me in a state of mind bordering on equanimity, if not indifference. The reason is, probably, that every one knows in advance what its final disposition will be. The majority in the House will uphold the action of the Democratic caucus by refusing new authorizations, the Senate will insist on at least one new battleship, and the House will finally yield to a program, so wisely limited, in order to keep the navy at its present efficiency.

Now, if my friends on the other side were actuated by a higher motive than that of mere economy I could probably get up some enthusiasm. If they had said the United States is in the best possible position to set the world an example by calling a halt to the mad

rivalry for excessive armaments, I would be tempted to take my hat off to them; but as it seems to be a question not of principle but of parsimony with them, a desire merely of making a showing, at the end of the session, of surplus cash rather than investments in behalf of the Government, I cannot help but feel more or less unconcerned, although I must say that the action of the Democratic caucus has served one good purpose—it has saved us from the annual Japanese war scare.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another and more cogent reason why the friends of peace and arbitration view the question of naval armaments with less concern now than they did even a few years ago. They have seen the light break in. An antidote has been found for the folly of the nations, and it may now safely be predicted that it is only a question of a short time when, through the force of public sentiment, arbitration will take the place of war in the settlement of international differences and when the nations will march, figuratively speaking, from abandoned battlefields to the Temple of Justice, there calmly to await the verdict of impartial judges in every case which threatens to disturb their peace. While it is true that governments cannot be persuaded to discard their implements of war so long as they actually need them for purposes of defense and national security, it is just as certain that no nation would maintain them much beyond the period when their absolute uselessness, except for police purposes, has been demonstrated. Hence, I hold that the question of armaments will solve itself. Its proper solution will be the natural sequence of the perfection of the legal machinery for the administration of international justice.

It is this question which I desire to discuss today. If the above premises are correct, then it becomes the patriotic duty of every good citizen by his vote and influence to hasten the day when in the intercourse of the nations judicial decisions will be recognized as the proper substitute for the arbitrament of the sword, proper because more humane, more civilized, and infinitely more economical.

Fortunately we are no longer in doubt as to how this great purpose can be accomplished. The consensus of opinion of the world's best thinkers is fixed upon three postulates, namely, general arbitration treaties, a high court of nations, and a code of international law to be sanctioned by all the national legislative bodies and enforced by the combined police powers of the world.

Thanks to the two Hague conferences, this plan is no longer a dream of visionaries or a vision of dreamers, nor is it the half-baked scheme of progressives who are overestimating the speed of rational advance. It is much more than that. It has become the concrete project upon which the governments of the whole world have concentrated their official minds ever since a President of the United States had the courage and the foresight to propose the settlement by arbitration of all justiciable questions. [Applause.]

Before I discuss President Taft's arbitration policy let me show you how far the plan of a high court of nations has progressed. Such a court has been a reality ever since 1899, when the first Hague conference created it in the shape of a panel from which a court was to be organized in each given case. While this court has officiated in a number of important cases to the full satisfaction of the world's opinion, yet there was a gen-